

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This response/amendment is submitted in response to the office action dated June 13, 2006. Reconsideration and allowance is requested.

Claims 21-24 remain in this application.

Specification

The paragraph beginning on page 6 at line 17 has been amended to correct a grammatical error. Similarly, the paragraph that begins on page 16 at line 24 and ends on page 18 at line 2 has been amended to correct a grammatical error.

Claim Rejection under 35 USC 103

In the Office Action, claim 21 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Yoshiaki (JP 63-297949) in view of Shimizu et al. (JP 03215196). Counsel for assignee does not believe that claim 21 is obvious under Yoshiaki in view of Shimizu for at least the reason that the inverter is not inherent. Nevertheless, in an effort to expedite prosecution claim 21 has been amended to specify that the inverter is "directly connected to an output of said AC electric power generator to receive and convert said AC electric power to DC electric power." Support for this amendment can be found throughout the originally filed specification including figures 9-10 and page 20 line 4 through page 22 line 1 of the originally filed specification. Counsel for assignee does not believe that the cited prior art teaches or suggests that the inverter is directly connected to an output of said AC electric power generator, as claimed.

Specifically, Shimizu teaches a power generating apparatus including a generator (1), rectifying bridge circuits (2,3), and inverter circuit (5). The inverter (5) is **not** directly connected to the output of the generator (1) but connected to the rectifying bridge circuits (2, 3). Since the inverter (5) is connected to the rectifying bridge circuit, the inverter (5) merely converts the DC power but does not act on the generator (1) to output AC power in the desired

voltage and frequency from the generator (1). Therefore, counsel for assignee believes that newly amended claim 21 is distinguishable over the cited references.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 21-24 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 8 and 9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,698,223 in view of Shimizu et al. (JP 03215196). Counsel for assignee includes a terminal disclaimer to overcome this rejection.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



Jesus Del Castillo
Reg. No. 51,604

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
JDC:gjs
60858424 v1